

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 22-07048-SPG(AGRx)

Date January 19, 2023

Title Dan Liu v. Alejandro Mayorkas et al

---

Present: The Honorable **SHERILYN PEACE GARNETT**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

---

P. Gomez

Not Reported

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:

Not Present

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Not Present

**Proceeding: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: DISMISSAL FOR LACK OF PROSECUTION**

Plaintiff(s) are **ORDERED** to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. *Link v. Wabash R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626 (1962) (Court has inherent power to dismiss for lack of prosecution on its own motion).

The below time period(s) has not been met. Accordingly, the Court, on its own motion, orders Plaintiff(s) to show cause, in writing, **on or before February 2, 2023**, why this action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. This matter will stand submitted upon the filing of Plaintiff(s) response. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 78. Failure to respond will be deemed consent to the dismissal of the action.

Absent a showing of good cause, an action must be dismissed without prejudice if the summons and complaint are not served on a Defendant within 90 days after the complaint is filed. Plaintiff(s) have failed to file a proof of service within 90 days of the filing of the Complaint on the following Defendant(s):

**Alejandro Mayorkas**

**Merrick Garland**

**David Radel**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No. CV 22-07048-SPG(AGRx)

Date January 19, 2023

Title Dan Liu v. Alejandro Mayorkas et al

---

Plaintiff(s) can satisfy this order by showing that service was effectuated within the 90 day deadline or by showing good cause for the failure to do so. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Initials of Preparer pg

---